REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-31 remain in the present application. Claims 5-6, 12-13 and 20-21 are cancelled herein. Claims 26-31 are added herein. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

Claim Objections

Claims 5-6, 12-13 and 20-21 are objected to as the original claims were revived from a cancelled state. Claims 5-6, 12-13 and 20-21 have been cancelled herein and the subject matter of these Claims has been reinstated as new Claims 26-31. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the objection is overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the rejection states that the present application fails to disclose the limitations "a control circuit... operable to register said indication as an input to said electronic device at one of said first height and said second height, wherein an input at said first height corresponds to said first display component activated by said control circuit, and wherein an input at said second height corresponds to said second display component activated by said control circuit" as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claims 11 and 19.

As described in the present application, a control circuit is operable to activate different display portions (e.g., display device 211 and display device 212 of Figure 5A) (see page 17, lines 20-22). Further, the present application describes that a user can interact with either display device 212 or display device 211 by changing the height of a stylus above the display (see page 19, lines 21-23). As such, it follows that there is a first height associated with a first display component (e.g., display device 212) and a second height associated with a second display component (e.g., display device 211), and therefore, the user may interact with each display component at the respective height associated with each display component. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection is overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-25

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,788,292 to Nako et al. (hereafter referred to as "Nako") in view of United States Patent Number 5,396,443 to Mese et al. (hereafter referred to as "Mese"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-25 are not rendered obvious by Nako in view of Mese for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites an input detection system for an electronic device comprising (emphasis added):

a first display component;

a second display component disposed above said first display component;

a sensor component operable to detect an indication in proximity to but not in contact with a surface of said electronic device and wherein said sensor is operable to differentiate between a first height and a second height of said indication above said second display component; and

a control circuit coupled to said sensor component and operable to register said indication as an input to said electronic device at one of said first height and said second height, wherein an input at said first height corresponds to said first display component activated by said control circuit, and wherein an input at said second height corresponds to said second display component activated by said control circuit.

Independent Claims 11 and 19 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-4, 8-10, 15-18 and 23-25 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that Nako fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a control circuit... operable to register said indication as an input to said electronic device at one of said first height and said second height," "wherein an input at said first height corresponds to said first display component," and "wherein an input at said second height corresponds to said second display component" as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited in the present application, an electronic device with two display components may receive inputs to a sensor at either a first height or a second height, where inputs at the first height correspond to a first display component and inputs at the second height correspond to a second display component.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Nako to teach a display device with two rotatably-coupled screens, where the display device displays pages of a book (Abstract) and allows pages to be turned by either touching a portion of the display screens (col. 7, lines 36-37, 40-42, 50-57 and 60-66) or opening and closing the display screens (col. 3, lines 20-24). Additionally, as acknowledged by the rejection, Nako fails to teach or suggest a

sensor for detecting an indication in proximity but not in contact with a surface as claimed (page 5 of the rejection). As such, Nako teaches input to the device at a single height (e.g., when in contact with the display surface). Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Nako teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching input to a device at a *single* height instead of at *multiple* heights as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that that Mese, either alone or in combination with Nako, fails to cure the deficiencies of Nako discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Mese also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a control circuit... operable to register said indication as an input to said electronic device at one of said first height and said second height" and "wherein an input at said first height corresponds with said first display component and an input at said second height corresponds with said second display component" as recited in independent Claim 1.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Mese to teach an electronic device with a sensor capable of receiving a single input when a pen or finger is within a given distance (Abstract; Figure 2; col. 4, lines 41-55). Specifically, as a pen/finger begins at an infinite distance and moves toward the electronic device, the device is kept in a power saving state (no input) until the pen/finger moves with a given distance (e.g. "d") to the device and the device recognizes its presence and transitions to a non-power saving state. The device is unable to recognize the presence of a pen/finger outside a given distance from the device, thereby providing only a single input to the device when a pen/finger moves within a given distance from the device. Moreover, whereas the device

and sensor of the present application is operable to receive two independent three-dimensional inputs (e.g., from gestures of a pen, finger, etc.) at either height, the device taught by Mese is limited to a single input regardless of the position of the pen/finger with regard to the electronic device. For example, even if the pen/finger is at two different heights within the given distance, the device taught by Mese will only register an "on" at both heights. As such, Mese teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that an electronic device receives only a single input instead of two independent inputs corresponding to dual display components as claimed.

Regarding the limitations of Claims 8, 15 and 23, Applicants respectfully assert that Nako fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said control circuit is operable to... alter a detection threshold of said sensor component when said cover is in said open position" as claimed. As described in the present application, a control circuit is operable to alter a detection threshold of the sensor component when the cover is in an open position, where the detection threshold relates to a distance from a display component of the electronic device.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Nako to teach a device without a sensor for differentiating between a first and second height. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Nako fails to teach or suggest altering a detection threshold of such a sensor as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that that Mese, either alone or in combination with Nako, fails to cure the deficiencies of Nako discussed above with respect to Claims 8, 15 and 23. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert

that Mese also fails to teach or suggest altering a detection threshold of a sensor as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Mese teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that a detection threshold is not changed when additional layers are added or removed from between an approaching object and the sensor (Figures 6 and 7; col. 10, lines 3 to 65). Specifically, Mese teaches that a single detection threshold of 10mm is sufficient to accommodate LCD panel 603 and protecting glass 607, such that the system would work with or without the additional layers. As such, assuming arguendo that the additional layers as taught by Mese are analogous to the cover as claimed, Mese teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that a single threshold is used when the additional layers are removed instead of adjusting the threshold as claimed.

Regarding the limitations of Claims 9, 16 and 24, Applicants respectfully assert that Nako fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said sensor component, responsive to said altered detection threshold, detects an indication above said second display component" as claimed. As described in the present application, a sensor is operable to detect an indication above a second display component in response to an altered detection threshold.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Nako to teach a device without a sensor for differentiating between a first and second height, and also not altering a detection threshold as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Nako fails to teach or suggest detecting an indication in response to altering a detection threshold of a sensor as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that that Mese, either alone or in combination with Nako, fails to cure the deficiencies of Nako discussed above with respect to Claims 9, 16 and 24. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Mese also fails to teach or suggest detecting an indication in response to altering a detection threshold of a sensor as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Nako in view of Mese, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since independent Claims 11 and 19 contain limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 11 and 19 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-21 and 23-25 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims and in light of the arguments presented for limitations of the dependent Claims, Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-21 and 23-25 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Therefore, Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-21 and 23-25 are allowable.

Claims 26-31

Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nako in view of Mese and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,445,574 to Saw et al. (hereafter referred to as "Saw"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 26-31 are not rendered obvious by Nako in view of Mese and further in view of Saw for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that that Saw, either alone or in combination with Nako and/or Mese, fails to cure the deficiencies of cited Nako/Mese combination discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Saw also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a control circuit... operable to register said indication as an input to said electronic device at one of said first height and said second height" and "wherein an input at said first height corresponds with said first display component and an input at said second height corresponds with said second display component" as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claims 11 and 19. Since Claims 26-31 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 26-31 are also allowable. Therefore, Claims 26-31 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-31 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 12/20, 2006

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060